

亞洲基督信仰與中國經典的相遇： 在對話中建構神學

Asian Christianity and Chinese Classics :
Doing Theology Dialogically

B. Vermander

17.10.2020

Contemporary Asian
theology intends to
proceed “dialogically”.

當代亞洲神學試圖
“對話式地”推進。

Fr Felix Wilfred (India) :

“In our context, dialogue must come first. Since in Asia, Christians are only a small minority, we dialogue through life situations with people of other faiths. Theology of harmony is part of the discussion and reflection on theology of dialogue.”

在我們的處境中，對話是第一位的。因為在亞洲，基督徒人數很少，我們通過生活境遇與其他宗教信徒展開對話。在關於「對話神學」的討論和思考中，「和諧神學」佔有一席之地。

亞洲主教團協會（FABC）在1974召開的第一次會議上，明確提出：優先通過對話，在三個層面深入亞洲的現實：宗教、文化、貧窮。

亞洲的福傳離不開「生活中的三重對話」：

- 與窮人對話（窮人的全面解放、窮人的選擇）
- 與其文化對話（處境化）
- 與其宗教信仰及哲學傳統對話（跨宗教對話）。

- Already during its first meeting in 1974, FABC (Federation of Asian Bishops Conference) articulated its preferential option for dialogue into the threefold reality of Asia: Religions, Cultures, and Poverty. Evangelization in Asia could not be separated from “living [a] triple dialogue: dialogue with the poor of Asia (integral liberation and option for the poor), dialogue with their cultures (inculturation) and dialogue with their religious and philosophical traditions (interreligious dialogue).”


- Dialogue seeks truth by trusting the other, just as dialectics pursues truth by trusting the order of things, the value of reason and weighty arguments. Dialectics is the optimism of reason; dialogue is the optimism of the heart. Dialectics believes it can approach truth by relying on the objective consistency of ideas. Dialogue believes it can advance along the way to truth by relying on the subjective consistency of the dialogical partners. Dialogue does not seek primarily to be duo-logue, a duet of two logoi, which would still be dialectical; but a dia-logos, a piercing of the logos to attain a truth that transcends it.

對話通過信任他者而尋求真理，正如辯證法通過信任事物的秩序、理性的價值與論證的力量來尋求真理。辯證法是理性的樂觀主義，對話是心靈的樂觀主義。辯證法相信能夠依據觀念的客觀一致性接近真理；對話則相信，依憑對話夥伴的主觀一致性，我們能夠沿真理之路前進。對話並不意圖成為兩種話語的辯證法式的二重唱；對話追求的是穿透邏格斯，以抵達超越話語的真理。

- «A Christian cannot assume at the outset that he knows what a Buddhist means when speaking about *nirvāṇa* and *anātman*, just as a Buddhist cannot immediately be expected to understand what a Christian means by God and Christ before they have encountered not just the concepts but their living context, which include different ways at looking at reality: they have to encounter each other before any meeting of doctrines.”
(Panikkar)

基督徒不能一開始就假定自己懂得佛教徒說的「涅槃」或「無我」是什麼意思，而佛教徒也不能指望立刻就明白基督徒說的「上帝」與「基督」的意義；他們首先需要相遇，不僅是與概念相遇，也是與生活處境相遇，在生活處境中其中包含著看待現實的不同方式：在教義的相遇之前，首先要有人與人的彼此相遇。（潘尼卡）

- Another Indian theologian, Jose Kuttianimattathil, SDB, has attempted to systematically describe the characteristics of dialogue when led in the Indian/Asian way:
- 另一位印度神学家试图系统地描述印度/亚洲式的对话的特点：



Jose Kuttianimattathil,
*Practice and Theology
of Interreligious
Dialogue*, Bangalore,
Kristu Jioty
Publications, 1995

- greater emphasis on the principle of identity than on the one of contradiction;
- emphasis on complementarity rather than on exclusion;
- emphasis on a perception of reality that is context-sensitive rather than “context-free”;
- emphasis on *realizing* rather than merely *knowing* the Ultimate reality;
- and, finally, emphasis on the relative character of every experience.

強調認同原則，而非突出某一種矛盾；

強調互補性，而非排斥性；

強調對現實的認知依賴於處境，而非脫離處境；

強調對終極現實的「實現」而非僅僅是「認識」；

強調每一種經驗都具有相對性。

中國的對話傳統

The Conversational Tradition in China

Donald Holzman, "The Conversational Tradition in Chinese Philosophy", *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Oct. 1956), p.226

“It is in the discussion of particular facts of human existence that Confucius, and after him the philosophers in the conversational tradition, produce their particular insights, short, incisive stabs, into the human condition. To organize his insights into a system would be to devitalize them. (...) The form of the Conversations is not an archaism, but is an integral part of Confucius' thought, and, indeed, an important clue to the character of Chinese thought in general.”

在对人类处境的讨论中，孔子以及后来的对话传统中的哲学家提出了独特而尖锐的洞见。若将孔子的思想系统化，将会使其失去活力。《论语》的形式不是老古董，而是孔子思想的有机组成，是中国思想总体特征的重要线索。

“Dialogue” and “knowledge” (including “theological knowledge”) 對話與知識（包括「神學知識」）

“Knowledge” may be of two kinds - either it refers to a given science such as physics, or else it refers to human beings considered in their nature and their social setting. In the first case, dialogic exchanges are at the same level of reality as the one induced by mathematical formulas by which the progress of knowledge concerning the material world is ensured. In the second case, the truth is not primarily mathematical.

有兩種「對話」：或是訴諸某種科學（如物理學），或是訴諸人類存在（人類本性與社會背景）。對前者而言，對話交流處與數學公式推導處在同一層面，數學為這個物質世界的知識提供保證。但對後者而言，真理的主要來源並非數學。

- In such a setting, dialogic exchange is no longer a mechanical process; rather, it centers around establishing relationships between “Others”: verbal exchanges imply that to experience the very act of *listening* is a transformative process that cannot be separated from the one through which truth is reached.

在此情況下，對話交流不再是一個機械過程；相反，對話所圍繞的中心是如何在「他者」之間建立關係：言語的交流意味著，對「傾聽」的體驗是一個轉化性的過程，不能與抵達真理的過程相分離。

Dialogue as a logical exercise

對話作為邏輯 練習

對話可以被理解為一種「邏輯練習」，旨在推出普遍有效的論題，這些論題屬於一個真理體系，建立在無矛盾律的基礎上。基本上，這種對話類似於科學家為了確定科學論證的真理而進行的自言自語。

Dialogue can be understood as a logical exercise that will generate propositions meant to be universally valid and part of a truth-system based on the principle of non-contradiction. It does not differ fundamentally from the soliloquy that a scientist would lead with himself in order to determine the truth of a scientific demonstration.

儘管如此，在亞里士多德的辯證法中，一個對話者的存在（有時是隱含的存在），對於確保事實和斷言——它們並不嚴格屬於知識領域，而是屬於意見的領域——的真實性，是必不可少的。

Still, in Aristotelian dialectics, the (sometimes implicit) presence of an interlocutor is required for ensuring the verisimilitude of facts and assertions that do not belong to the strict domain of science but rather to the one of the *doxa*.

Socratic Dialogue as Drama

作為戲劇的蘇格拉底式 對話



Socratic dialogues are written as if they were played on a *theatrical scene*, the plot being that the very possibility of reaching agreement will be tested in various ways. They are best understood as dramas culminating into successes or failures, the trial of Socrates exemplifying the intensity that the dialogic confrontation may ultimately reach.

蘇格拉底式的對話好像是在戲劇舞台上的表演，以不同方式檢驗達到同意的可能性，由此構成了故事情節。這些對話完全可以理解為在成功和失敗的高潮中結束的戲劇。「蘇格拉底的審判」就是一個例子，表現了對話衝突最終可能達到如何強烈的程度。

Scholasticism as Dialogic Style 作為對話方式的 士林哲學



Scholasticism, understood as a dialogic style undergoing various expressions in time and space, works on similar principles except that the reference to "universal" principles grounded on the natural light is supplemented by a reference text - the one accepted by the School. The principle of non-contradiction is exercised within the reading of these texts.

士林哲學被理解為一種對話形式，它在時間和空間上有不同表達，基於一些類似原則而工作；不過，對建立在自然光照基礎上的「共相」原則的引用，需要得到學院認可的某個文本依據作為補充。「無矛盾律」也被用來閱讀這些文本。

Dialogues of life:

Confucianism

生活的對話：

儒學

In contrast, the type of dialogue initiated and exemplified by Confucius' *Analects* is first a "dialogue of life" which seeks to ensure that the disciple's deeds coincide with his system of moral and cosmological beliefs. Dialogue is the gateway through which to match truth and life. Thus, the dialogic form is by no means a rhetorical device and is intrinsically linked to the nature of the truth to be reached and lived.

相比之下，孔子《論語》中的對話及其對話形式，首先是一種「生活的對話」，旨在確保弟子們的行為符合於其道德和宇宙觀的體系。真理與生活經過對話之門相互匹配。因此，對話形式絕不是一種修辭策略，它與人們要達到並活出的真理本質有著內在聯繫。

The Gospel's Dialogic Style 福音中的對話方式

The Gospels' dialogic style is somehow similar to the preceding category, with the difference that the stress is put less on acquired wisdom than on the transformative process through which a decision is to be reached by the one who enters into a dialogue of life.

福音書中的對話風格與論語的風格有些類似，但不同在於，福音並不那麼強調智慧的獲取，而更強調轉化的過程，使得進入這樣一場生活對話的人，能夠經由這個過程而作出決定。

Dialogue as “Enlightenment”

對話作為 “啟蒙”

We can group together several cultural and literary settings in which dialogue is meant to lead to "enlightenment", as shown in the peculiar dialogical styles found in Zhuangzi or in Zen writings: the dialogue is pushed to a breaking point that challenges the principle of non-contradiction, bringing one of the participants to a sudden transformation of his consciousness or worldview.

我們可以將幾種文化與文學環境歸為一類：在其中，對話旨在帶來“啟蒙”，如莊子或禪宗著作的獨特對話風格：對話被推向了挑戰“無矛盾律”的突破點，使參與對話的一方的意識或世界觀驟然發生轉變。



Dialogue and Equality

對話與平等

And there is of course the broad category that gathers variants of "democratic dialogue", a dialogic style which applies not only to politics but to some models of interreligious dialogue for example: the point here is that the process of listening is supposed to be *mutually transformative* for the partners once they enter an empathic understanding of the argument and experiences of the vis-à-vis, this in order to find a position on the basis of which to allow a common decision or, at the very least, ensure continued coexistence.

可以用一個廣泛的範疇概括「民主對話」的各種形式。這種對話方式不僅適用於政治，也適用於某些模式的宗教間對話：關鍵在於，對話者一旦對對方的論證與經驗產生了「共情」或「同理心」，聆聽的過程就會帶來雙方的「相互轉變」，為能找到一個立場，讓雙方能夠作出共同決定，或至少能夠確保雙方持續共存。

“{With the development of democratic societies}, the authority of the holy is gradually replaced by the authority of an achieved consensus.”
(Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action*)

「[隨著民主社會的發展], 神聖性的權威逐漸讓位於一種既達共識的權威。」

(哈貝馬斯《交往行為理論》)

- We may qualify as "performative" all dialogues in which the trust placed in the partner of the exchange allows for the transformative nature of the experience, and we may consider as "constative" those dialogues that are engaged in order to verify compliance of fact or opinion, or adequacy of the theory to the facts.
- 一些對話可以被視為“施行式對話”：對話雙方心存信任，從而使交流的體驗帶來對話者的轉變；另一些對話則是“檢驗式對話”，是為了彼此確認事實或意見是否相符，或者檢驗理論是否足以說明事實。

Performative and Constative Dialogues

施行式对话与 检验式对话

- 遵循同樣的思路，我們似乎能夠將不同的對話風格視為不同的語言遊戲，其規則和不同的生活風格密不可分。每一種對話風格被當成一個類型，是一個由規則定義的封閉體系，它確實也是一種« 思想體驗 »。
- Pursuing the same line, it becomes possible to consider the different dialogic styles as language-games, the rules of which are linked with different forms of life.

Dialogue and
Language-
Games
對話
與語言遊戲

Making sense of Language-Games

理解語言遊戲

維特根斯坦(Wittgenstein) 使用“語言遊戲”一詞的方式很靈活。在此，我採用他如下的簡要定義：語言遊戲是“使用符號的方式，比我們使用高度複雜化的日常語言的符號的方式要更加簡單。”

“ways of using signs simpler than those in which we use the signs of our highly complicated everyday language.” (The Blue Book p. 17, in The Blue and Brown Books, Oxford University Press, 1969.)

- “信仰對話” 或者由非常不同的文化背景的人之間進行的對話，類似於維特根斯坦給出的的一個簡單例子：建造者的遊戲，或由四個詞組成的語言。遊戲一旦展開，讓雙方都基於彼此互動的經驗參與“建造”，就會逐漸豐富起來。
- 這裡的“對話”是一種涉及雙方的“語言遊戲”，其規則能夠通過相互同意而不斷得到改變和豐富。“

- A “dialogue of faith” or a dialogue pursued among partners with very different cultural backgrounds will first resemble one of the simple examples (game of the builder, or language constituted through four words) given by Wittgenstein, and will be progressively enriched once the pursuit of the game will have allowed both partners to “build” upon their experience of engaging the other.
- “Dialogue” here is an evolving language-game, the rules of which can be perpetually changed and enriched by mutual consent.

- Meeting with a variety of Classics implies to meet with a diversity of styles. Confucius, Zhuangzi, Jesus, the Indian Sages, Shakyamuni, Socrates or Seneca enter into dialogue with their disciples, their adversaries and the generations of readers who have been dealing with their testimonies in widely different fashions.

與各種經典相遇，意味著與多種風格相遇。孔子、莊子、耶穌、印度聖賢、釋迦牟尼、蘇格拉底、塞內卡，他們與門徒、與對手、也與一代又一代的各以不同方式看待他們的讀者進行對話。

對經典的對話式閱讀，探索著全球對話的廣度與局限。今天，對話與敘事聯繫起來，這些敘事至少潛在地將蘇格拉底、孔子、老子、佛陀、耶穌與穆罕默德的門徒們聚集起來，成為一個“對話體”。

- Dialogic readings of Classics explore the extent and limits of the global conversation. Dialogue today connects narratives that, at least virtually, gather the disciples of Socrates, Confucius, Laozi, Buddha, Jesus and Mohamed into a conversing body.

• Chloë Starr opens up interesting perspectives as to the relations between text and practice in the Chinese way of reading Classics, and, consequently, in Chinese theological tradition: “Chinese theology, like Chinese text reading, is essentially relational: this is not the virtuoso performance of a scholastic, where the reader, or students, follows along the steps to their logical conclusion, but a more open process, where the reader, conceived as a peer, is invited to make connections from within a shared intranet of allusions”

關於中國經典閱讀的方式、以及中國神學傳統中的文本與實踐之間的關係，Chloë Starr 提出了一個有趣的觀點：“中國的神學，就像中國的文本閱讀，本質上是關係性的：它不是學者的表演，指導讀者或學生循序漸進地達到邏輯結論。它是一個更為開放的過程，邀請讀者成為夥伴，在一個典故的共享網絡內部建立起聯繫。”

- “Just as Christianity was being transformed into Chinese forms by local adaptation and innovation in communities and patterns of prayers built around a church or mission house, so Chinese Christian theology underwent its own process of transformation into a local textual religion.” (Starr *ibid.*, 40)

“正如基督教通過本地適應、團體中的創新以及圍繞著教堂或傳教點發展起來的祈禱模式而轉變成為中國形式的基督教一樣，中國的基督教神學也經歷了其自身轉變的過程，成為一種本地性的文本宗教。”

In the Chinese context, interreligious dialogue is dialogue among texts embodied, “interpreted” into communal forms of life.

在中国的处境中，宗教间对话是文本间的对话，这些文本体现为或被“解释”为生活的共同形式。

- 對話中的誤解通常是在其中一位參與者單方面更改語言使用規則時發生的，他對雙方已經達到的相互理解程度過於自信。
- 通過嚴格遵守對話的最初規則，實現“對話的儀式化”，將會使對話逐漸豐富，因為對話者之間漸漸產生的理解將有助於發展交流的“句法”。

- Misunderstandings in dialogue usually happen when the rules governing the use of language are unilaterally changed by one of the players, overconfident as to the degree of mutual comprehension already reached. The *ritualization of dialogue* operated through strict respect of its initial rules will allow for its progressive enrichment, as the understanding developing among the interlocutors will allow for the development of the “syntax” governing the exchange.

For instance, both Confucianism and Christianity consider rites as a vector of respect and sharing, as a way of growing forms of life that need to be protected and nurtured. This suggests that paying attention to the *forms* taken by rituals, exchanges and lifestyles is a privileged vector for entering into their *substance*.

例如，儒家和基督教都將認為，禮儀承載著尊敬與分享，都將禮儀視為一種需要得到保護和滋養的生活成長形式。這表明，關注禮儀、交流與生活風格所具有的「形式」，最能夠使我們進入它們的「實質」。

Some musings about the limits of language (and dialogue?)....

語言（及對話）之局限性的困惑

- He [Confucius] said: "I wish I didn't use words." Zigong objected: "Master, if you don't use words, what is there for us, your disciples, to transmit?" He replied: "[Well, let me ask you:] What does Heaven say? And still the Four Seasons follow their path and the creatures of the world live their lives. [I ask you:] What does Heaven say?" (17.19)

子曰：「予欲無言。」
子貢曰：「子如不言，則
小子何述焉？」子曰：
「天何言哉？四時行焉，
百物生焉。天何言哉？」
（論語·陽貨第十七）

• 子欲居九夷。或曰：「陋，如之何？」子曰：「君子居之，何陋之有？」

（論語·子罕第十四）

- He [Confucius] wanted to go and live among the Nine Barbarians. Someone said: "Think of their uncouthness. What are you going to do about that?" He [Confucius] said: "[You see,] once a gentleman lives among them, what uncouthness is there?" (9:14)

- This leads us back to the main insight found in Asian theologies' dialogic style:

Dialogue is transformative of the interlocutors, and, therefore, of reality itself.

- 這把我們帶回了亞洲神學之對話風格的主要洞見：
對話是對話者的轉變，
從而也是對現實本身的轉變。